**OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION STAGES**

## This document defines the criteria to evaluate the different categories of tenderer’s submissions, by the quality factor or criteria. Each evaluation criteria group has a defined weightage of importance.

## **Stage A – Category 8A – Individual (Onsite)**

### Tender Offer(s) for Category 8A (Individual (Onsite)) will be based on the criteria in the table below.

| **S/N** | **Criteria** | **Weightage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Quality Factors** | |
| 1.1 | Strong capabilities of Tenderer’s practices, capabilities and experiences in delivering both agile outsource and time & material contracts:   1. Number of successful projects delivered through time & material or turnkey. 2. List of digital products[[1]](#footnote-1) or services that tenderer offers 3. Capabilities of Tenderer in Agile, Coding and Architecture (i.e. NUS-ISS Technical Assessments and the GovTech Agile Test) 4. Years of experience in supplying and managing Agile Co-Development and ICT professional services. | 30% |
| 1.2 | Tenderer to provide as many good track records as possible in providing similar services in Singapore and achieved:   1. Feedback from customers 2. turnaround time to provide CV to its clients 3. turnaround time to onboard personnel 4. staff retention rate. | 15% |
| 1.3 | Comprehensive hiring practices in attraction, selection and retention of agile co-development and ICT professionals | 15% |
| **2** | **Price Competitiveness** | |
| 2.1 | Rates of professional services | 40% |

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Weightage for Tender Offers for Category 8A

## **Stage B – Category 8B – Individual (Offsite)**

### Quality evaluation will be conducted for each Offsite Facility Location proposed by Tenderers.

### Tender Offer(s) for Category 8B (Individual (Offsite)) of the recommended Tenderers in Stage A will be further evaluated based on the criteria in the table below.

| **S/N** | **Criteria** | **Weightage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Quality Factors 60%** | |
| 1.1 | Secure the physical environment, endpoint and network | 14% |
| 1.2 | Process for access control (including segregation and review of access rights) | 8% |
| 1.8 | Process for recruitment and retention | 5% |
| 1.9 | Process for capability development/upskilling, gathering of feedback on Offsite staff performance and support for the Authority’s technical stack | 5% |
| **2** | **Price Competitiveness** | |
| 2.1 | Rates of professional services | 40% |

Table 2: Evaluation Criteria and Weightage for Tender Offers for Category 8B

## **Stage C - Category 9 – Squad (Onsite)**

### Tender Offer(s) for Category 9 (Squad (Onsite)) will be based on the criteria in the table below. The Tenderer shall propose **all the job roles** as set in Part 2 Section A, non-compliance to this criterion will lead to the proposal liable for disqualification.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Criteria** | **Weightage** |
| **1** | **Quality Factors** | |
| 1.1 | Strong capabilities of Tenderer’s practices, capabilities and experiences in delivering agile time & material:   1. Number of successful projects delivered through time & material. 2. List of digital products[[2]](#footnote-2) or services that tenderer offers 3. Capabilities of Tenderer in Agile, Coding and Architecture (i.e. NUS-ISS Technical Assessments and the GovTech Agile Test) 4. Years of experience in supplying and managing Agile Co-Development and ICT professional services using a squad model 5. No. of projects with knowledge transfer performed in areas of Agile Methodology and Practices | 21% |
| 1.2 | Tenderer to provide as many good track records as possible in providing similar services in Singapore and achieved:   1. Feedback from customers 2. Turnaround time to provide CV to its clients 3. Turnaround time to onboard personnel 4. staff retention rate. | 14% |
| 1.3 | Comprehensive hiring practices in attraction, selection and retention of agile co-development and ICT professionals | 10% |
| 1.4 | Delivery practices to ensure team velocity and quality of deliverables | 15% |
| **2** | **Price Competitiveness** | |
| 2.1 | Rates of professional services | 40% |

Table 3: Evaluation Criteria and Weightage for Tender Offers for Category 9

**DETAILED EVALUATION APPROACH**

Below tables list the evaluation criteria for each quality factor, and the respective assessment criteria for quality score range.

## **Quality Evaluation Criteria for Category 8B**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Criteria** | **Weights** | **Score** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **1.3** | **Hiring Practices** | **15%** |  |
|  |
| [Part 3 Annex II-E1] |
| A | Attraction to maintain a constant pipeline of resources | 5% |  |
|  | ·     Weak criteria: Limited focus on attracting candidates through online advertisements without utilizing other sources or outreach methods |  | 1 |
|  | ·     Basic criteria: Incorporating online advertisements with additional sources such as referral schemes or career fairs to attract candidates |  | 2 |
|  | ·     Average criteria: Implementing online advertisements and active outreach to targeted candidate pools for attraction and engagement |  | 3 |
|  | ·     Strong criteria: Utilizing online advertisements, proactive outreach, and innovative methods to attract and maintain a consistent pipeline of qualified candidates |  | 4 |
| B | Selection methods to shortlist candidates | 5% |  |
|  | ·        **Relevance of Selection Criteria**: |  |  |
|  | o   Weak: Selection criteria are vague and not directly related to the job requirements. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Selection criteria are somewhat aligned with the job requirements. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Selection criteria are clearly defined and somewhat aligned with the job requirements. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Selection criteria are clearly defined and closely aligned with the skills and attributes needed for the role. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Transparency in Selection Process**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Lack of communication on selection process and criteria. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Limited communication on the selection process and criteria. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Clear communication on the selection process, criteria, and timeline provided to all candidates. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Transparent communication on the selection process, criteria, and timeline provided to all candidates. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Use of Multiple Selection Methods**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Reliance on a single selection method (e.g., only resume screening). | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Limited use of multiple selection methods. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Utilization of multiple methods such as interviews, assessments, references, etc., to evaluate candidates. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Comprehensive use of multiple methods to evaluate candidates effectively. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Consistency in Evaluation**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Inconsistent evaluation criteria applied to different candidates. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Some consistency in evaluation criteria applied to all candidates. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Consistent evaluation criteria applied to all candidates to ensure fairness. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Rigorous consistency in evaluation criteria applied to all candidates. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Bias Mitigation**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Unconscious biases influencing the selection process. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Some measures in place to mitigate biases. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Efforts made to mitigate biases and ensure fair evaluation of all candidates. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Comprehensive measures in place to mitigate biases and ensure a fair evaluation process. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Candidate Experience**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Lack of feedback or communication with candidates throughout the process. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Limited feedback provided to candidates. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Providing timely feedback and a positive experience for all candidates, regardless of the outcome. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Exceptional candidate experience provided with timely feedback and support. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Assessment of Job Fit**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Candidates are not assessed for their fit with the job role and organizational culture. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Some assessment of job fit conducted. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Evaluation includes assessing candidates' skills, experience, and cultural fit with the organization. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Thorough assessment of candidates for their fit with the job role and organizational culture. | 4 |
|  | ·        **Validity and Reliability of Selection Methods**: |  |
|  | o   Weak: Selection methods are not validated or reliable in predicting candidate performance. | 1 |
|  | o   Basic: Some validation and reliability in selection methods. | 2 |
|  | o   Average: Use of validated and reliable selection methods to assess candidates' potential for success. | 3 |
|  | o   Strong: Extensive use of validated and reliable selection methods to accurately assess candidates' potential for success. | 4 |
| C | Staff retention program | 5% |  |
|  | **1.Training and Development Opportunities:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Limited or outdated training programs that do not align with employees' career goals and organizational needs. For example, Company X provides generic training sessions without considering individual skill development. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic training programs offered sporadically with minimal opportunities for career advancement. An example is Company Y, which provides occasional training workshops but lacks a structured development plan for employees. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Regular training opportunities aligned with employees' career paths and skill development needs. Company Z offers ongoing training programs tailored to employees' growth areas, contributing to their professional advancement. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Comprehensive and personalized training and development programs that support employees' continuous learning and career progression. For instance, Company A implements a mentorship program and provides access to online courses to enhance employees' skills and knowledge. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **2. Recognition and Rewards System:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Absence of formal recognition programs or rewards for employee achievements, leading to low morale and motivation. Company B lacks a system to acknowledge employees' contributions, impacting their engagement and job satisfaction. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Limited recognition efforts with occasional rewards for outstanding performance, resulting in inconsistent motivation levels. An example is Company C, which offers sporadic bonuses but lacks a structured recognition framework. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Consistent recognition initiatives and rewards for employees' accomplishments, fostering a culture of appreciation and motivation. Company D implements monthly recognition awards and performance bonuses to recognize employees' efforts. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Robust recognition and rewards system that celebrates achievements and incentivizes high performance. Company E has a structured recognition program with quarterly awards, peer nominations, and performance-based incentives, boosting employee morale and retention. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **3. Work-Life Balance Initiatives:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Lack of policies supporting work-life balance, leading to high stress levels and burnout among employees. Company F does not offer flexible work arrangements or wellness programs, impacting employee well-being. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Limited flexibility in work arrangements or minimal support for personal well-being, resulting in work-life imbalance. An example is Company G, which offers limited remote work options and lacks mental health support initiatives. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Policies promoting work-life balance, such as flexible hours and wellness programs, contributing to a healthier work environment. Company H provides flexible scheduling options and wellness workshops to support employees' well-being. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Comprehensive work-life balance initiatives, including wellness programs, mental health support, and flexible work arrangements tailored to individual needs. Company I offers on-site fitness classes, mental health resources, and remote work options, prioritizing employees' work-life balance. |  | 4 |

Table 5: Detailed Quality Evaluation for Tender Offers for Category 8A

## **Quality Evaluation for Category 8B – Individual (Offsite)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Criteria** | **Weights** | **Score** |
| **1.1** | **Secure the physical environment, endpoint and network** | **14%** |  |
| A | **1. Physical Environment Security:** | 3% |  |
|  | **Access Control Systems:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Lack of access control measures, such as key locks only. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic access control with keycards or PIN codes. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Biometric access control or smart card authentication. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Multi-factor authentication with biometrics and video surveillance. |  | 4 |
|  | **Environmental Monitoring:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No environmental monitoring systems in place. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic temperature monitoring without alerts. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Real-time monitoring with alerts for temperature and humidity fluctuations. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Automated monitoring with alerts and remote access to environmental controls. |  | 4 |
|  | **Redundancy Measures:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Lack of backup power sources or cooling redundancy. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic backup power supply without redundancy. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Redundant power supplies and cooling systems. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Fully redundant systems with failover mechanisms in place. |  | 4 |
| B | **2. Endpoint Security:** | 3% |  |
|  | **Antivirus Software:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Outdated antivirus software or no antivirus protection. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic antivirus software with manual updates. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Advanced antivirus with real-time scanning and automatic updates. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Endpoint protection platform with AI-driven threat detection. |  | 4 |
|  | **Endpoint Encryption:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No endpoint encryption in place. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic encryption for sensitive data only. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Encryption for all data on endpoints. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Full-disk encryption with key management. |  | 4 |
|  | **Application Whitelisting:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No application control mechanisms. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic application whitelisting for critical applications. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Comprehensive application control with whitelisting and blacklisting. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Dynamic application whitelisting based on behavior analysis. |  | 4 |
| C | **3. Network Security:** | 4% |  |
|  | **Firewalls and IDS/IPS:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No firewall or intrusion detection/prevention system. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic firewall protection without advanced features. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Next-generation firewall with IDS/IPS capabilities. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Unified threat management system with advanced threat detection. |  | 4 |
|  | **VPN and Secure Connections:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No VPN or secure connection options. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic VPN for remote access. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** SSL/TLS encrypted connections for secure communication. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Multi-protocol VPN with strong encryption standards. |  | 4 |
|  | **Network Segmentation:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Flat network structure without segmentation. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic network segmentation with limited access controls. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** VLAN segmentation with access controls. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Micro-segmentation with granular access policies. |  | 4 |
| D | **4. Compliance and Certifications:** | 2% |  |
|  | **Certifications:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** Lack of relevant security certifications. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic compliance with industry standards. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Compliance with industry-specific regulations. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Multiple certifications demonstrating commitment to security. |  | 4 |
|  | **Compliance Frameworks:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No alignment with regulatory frameworks. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic compliance with general data protection regulations. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Alignment with industry-specific regulations. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Comprehensive compliance with multiple regulatory frameworks. |  | 4 |
| E | **5. Incident Response and Monitoring:** | 2% |  |
|  | **Incident Response Plan:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No documented incident response plan. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic incident response procedures without formal documentation. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Documented incident response plan with defined roles and responsibilities. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Regularly tested and updated incident response plan. |  | 4 |
|  | **Continuous Monitoring:** |  |  |
|  | **Weak:** No security monitoring tools in place. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic security monitoring without real-time alerts. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Continuous monitoring with alerts for suspicious activities. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Advanced security information and event management (SIEM) system for real-time threat detection. |  | 4 |
| **1.2** | **Process for access control (including segregation and review of access rights)** | **8%** |  |
| A | **1. Access Control Policies and Procedures:** | 2% |  |
|  | **Weak:** Lack of documented access control policies and procedures or outdated and incomplete documentation. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic access control policies and procedures in place but not clearly defined or not regularly updated. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Well-defined and up-to-date access control policies and procedures that are communicated and enforced consistently. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Comprehensive, clear, and regularly reviewed access control policies and procedures aligned with industry best practices and regulatory requirements. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| B | **2. Segregation of Duties:** | 1% |  |
|  | **Weak:** No segregation of duties policy or inadequate segregation leading to potential conflicts of interest. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic segregation of duties implemented but lacks enforcement mechanisms or clear role definitions. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Segregation of duties enforced through access controls and clearly defined roles and responsibilities. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Granular segregation of duties with strict controls to prevent unauthorized access and conflicts of interest. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| C | **3. User Access Provisioning and De-provisioning:** | 2% |  |
|  | **Weak:** Manual and error-prone access provisioning and de-provisioning processes or delays in granting or revoking access rights. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic user access provisioning and de-provisioning processes with some automation but lack of efficiency. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Automated and efficient user access provisioning and de-provisioning processes with clear workflows and approvals. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Streamlined and automated user access provisioning and de-provisioning with role-based access controls and timely revocation of access rights. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| D | **4. Monitoring and Logging:** | 2% |  |
|  | **Weak:** Inadequate access monitoring and logging capabilities or lack of real-time alerts for unauthorized access attempts. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic access monitoring and logging in place but manual review processes and limited visibility into access activities. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Automated access monitoring with real-time alerts for suspicious activities and comprehensive logging of access events. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Advanced access monitoring with behavior analytics, anomaly detection, and immediate response mechanisms for security incidents. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| E | **5. Compliance and Regulatory Alignment:** | 1% |  |
|  | **Weak:** Non-compliance with relevant regulations and industry standards or lack of alignment with specific data protection requirements. |  | 1 |
|  | **Basic:** Basic compliance with general access control best practices but lacking specific alignment with regulatory requirements. |  | 2 |
|  | **Average:** Compliance with industry-specific regulations such as GDPR, HIPAA, ISO 27001, or PCI DSS with regular audits. |  | 3 |
|  | **Strong:** Comprehensive compliance with industry standards and regulations, with proactive adherence to data protection laws and security frameworks. |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |

1. A digital product is a product that is delivered or consumed through digital channels, such as the internet or mobile devices. It can be a software application, a website, a mobile app, a digital service, or any other type of product that is primarily delivered or consumed through digital means. Digital products are typically developed using software development methodologies and tools, and may involve a team of designers, developers, and product managers working together to create a user-friendly and effective product that meets the needs of its intended users. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A digital product is a product that is delivered or consumed through digital channels, such as the internet or mobile devices. It can be a software application, a website, a mobile app, a digital service, or any other type of product that is primarily delivered or consumed through digital means. Digital products are typically developed using software development methodologies and tools, and may involve a team of designers, developers, and product managers working together to create a user-friendly and effective product that meets the needs of its intended users. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)